

KROPOTKIN MEMORIAL NUMBER

VANGUARD

A LIBERTARIAN COMMUNIST JOURNAL

Vol. II — No. 6

JANUARY-FEBRUARY, 1936

Price 10 Cents

in this issue:

TOM MOONEY

on

The Frame-up System

•

EMMA GOLDMAN

on

Sanctions and The Working Class

•

Who Are the Progressives in A. F. of L.? - by Sam Weiner

Libertarian Communism in the Transitional Period-by Senex

Social Security a la Townsend — — — — by S. Morrison

Which Way For The Negro? — — by George Creighton

Book Review: — — — — Franz Mehring's "Karl Marx"

The Labor Movement Abroad: — France, Spain, Japan

•

Published by VANGUARD GROUP, 45 West 17th Street, New York

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL by KROPOTKIN

Peter Kropotkin — The Struggle For A New Liberty

This month the libertarian movement all over the world is commemorating the death of one of its great moving spirits, one of the great inspiring figures of our epoch. Fifteen years is a very short period in the ordinary run of events. But during the last brief interval of time so stupendous were the changes wrought in the life of our civilization that once more the libertarian world has to ask itself the question: How far have its basic ideas laid down by its greatest theoretician been substantiated by the latest events. This question is the more pertinent that too often Kropotkin's views are confused with the historic brand of liberalism, the full bankruptcy of which has been so clearly brought out by the catastrophic events of the last fifteen years. Liberty from this point of view is the product of orderly peaceful development secured by the efforts of the cultured prosperous minority and not by the collective action of the great masses of people. That is why liberty must deteriorate whenever great collective passions are unchained by the pressure of a disintegrating social mechanism.

And one of the significant things these yearly commemorations of the great libertarian thinker should do, is to bring out in full Kropotkin's fruitful and dynamic conception of liberty, so necessary in this period of disillusionment with the decadent and stagnant ideal of the old liberalism. A conception of liberty that is integrated with the great social struggles and not kept apart from them; one that is based upon the collective aspirations towards justice and not the snobbery of a cultured few. Had the great social movement of the last half century been more permeated with this dynamic conception of liberty, it would not have come to the impasse of the last fifteen years.

The tragic divorce between revolution and liberty which on the one hand drove the revolutionists into the camp of a semi-fascist authoritarianism, and on the other hand frightened all the liberty-loving workers into rank opportunism was in no small measure due to the fact that Kropotkin's profound conceptions of a libertarian revolutionary movement remained unknown to the larger masses of people.

Therein lies one of the great lessons to be reaffirmed now with even greater emphasis than ever. The old world is tottering, and along with it the old, circumscribed, cribbed, confined kind of liberty. This does not spell the death of liberty as such, violent as a temporary swing away from it might be. It is the birth pangs of a new broader type of liberty coming to life in the great elemental passions of the mass movements of our times, in the crash of the political and economic institutions, and the rebuilding of a new world upon a broader basis of justice for all.

SENEX.

Prosperity — For Whom?

Stockholders, and big business in general, certainly have good reason to rejoice upon the coming of "Prosperity". The New Deal has been very good to them in 1935. The value of all stocks jumped from thirty-four billions in 1934 to forty-six billions in 1935, an increase of 37%. Dividends were declared on 1,447 stocks in 1934 as, compared with 1,549 in 1935; while *extra* dividends were declared on 800 other stocks.

Business picked up, production of steel, textiles, automobiles, electrical power, wool, and many other commodities, was greater than at any other period since 1929. Business may look forward to even better prospects in 1936; for no increases in taxation are contemplated, and the budget is about to be balanced. President Roosevelt, despite his declared intentions of "driving money-changers from the temple", and putting big business in its place, has certainly fulfilled his pledge of a New Deal to business.

How goes it with the unemployed, the exploited workers, those on relief? Is there a New Deal in wages, in living standards? Has the "Prosperity" of businessmen and stockholders reflected itself upon the wage workers and the unemployed?

In the past year, the cost of living has increased 4.3%, and real wages—the purchasing power of wages—are 1% less than at the lowest point in the depression year 1932. The standard of living today is just as low as it was in 1932.

There are 11,500,000 unemployed and there are more on relief than ever before. Even those on work relief projects are having their wages cut, and are facing the prospect of a still lower standard of living in 1936.

The basic conditions of the capitalist crisis remain unaltered; mass starvation and mass unemployment are increasing as the capitalists load the cost of the depression on the backs of the workers. It is certain that the exploited will not long be able to stand under this strain, and already the signs of discontent and revolt grow more ominous as the capitalist system grows more oppressive.

We look forward to growing class struggles—the workers will not easily be misled by the false ballyhoo of "Prosperity" made by politicians as Election Day draws nearer.

S. W.

The First International

By PETER KROPOTKIN

(EDITOR'S NOTE:—The bankruptcy of the Third International, so evident now with its complete failure to forge a consistent international policy as an answer to the war danger, has brought again to the foreground the question of the basic principles upon which a true "International" should be built. The Third International was closely modelled on the pattern of Marx's and Engels's organizational ideas, and its failure goes back to a much deeper historical cause than the temporary triumph of a certain faction within it. Like the Second International it was doomed from its very beginning, having distorted the originally sound principles of

the First International to serve the aims of a party or a clique. It is therefore of utmost importance to bring out again the significance of those original principles of the great International Workingmens Association. Needless to say, there is hardly any one who had a better grasp of those principles than Peter Kropotkin who at one time was one of its most active workers and theoreticians.

This article, printed now for the first time in the English language, is taken from "LES TEMPS NOUVEAUX" of August 29, 1896. It is one of a series of articles by Peter Kropotkin on the 1896 Congress of the Second International. This brilliant sketch is a digression written for the purpose of comparing the achievements of the great First International with the social-democratic fiasco in London in 1896).

Things happen so quickly nowadays that we very easily forget events which are of the greatest importance in contemporary history. Among these events there is one which stands out above all the others. I am referring to the great achievements of the International Workingmens Association (The First International) in its early years and the tremendous scope of its first four Congresses from 1866 to 1869.

What made these Congresses so successful? What gave them their historic scope, a scope so great that in spite of what those who boast that they are "scientific socialists" may have to say on this question, the fact remains that the minutes of these four Congresses constitute the epitome of all modern socialism? It is there, in reality, and not in the obscure writings of Marx and Engels that we have learned the socialism of modern times, the socialism to which we adhere.

The answer is simple. The first Congresses of the International did not seek to control the socialist movement: they sought rather to find its expression. They did not pose as "Parliaments of Labor". (This absurd name was invented at a later date.) They were simply places where workers from various sections of the world could exchange ideas.

The founders of modern socialism—of the "fourth awakening of the proletariat" to quote Malon—did not try to make themselves the masters of the young movement. They tried to *learn*; learn from some, and teach others. The great masses of workers, they said, are being stirred by new currents. It is not the communism of Fourier, or Cabet, of Robert Owen or of Pierre Leroux, nor the "governmentarianism" of Louis Blanc nor the mutualism of Proudhon, nor the neo-christianism of Lamennais. The modern ideology has, to be sure, been influenced by these ideas, but it differs essentially from all of these. It is necessary, therefore, to develop new ideological trends, to affirm them and to find their concrete expression.

It is not to the bourgeoisie—not even the most highly inspired—to whom we must turn for this concrete expression. The whole mental set of the bourgeoisie is warped by its science, by its education, by the fact that it lives at the expense of the working class. It is the workers themselves, those who remain in the ranks of the toiling masses, who partake of its life, of its joys and its sorrows, whom we must ask for the concrete expression of these aspirations. And it is they who must carry on the day by day struggle against capitalist domination, not by placing themselves within the sphere of political struggles where they surely will be swallowed up by the bourgeois species, but by continuing on the plane of economic struggles.

The watchword of that epoch was, "the emancipation of the working class is the task of the working class itself." And this formula was taken literally. Later on it was replaced by the deceitful formula that the task of the emancipation of the working classes should be left to a few, chosen in the electoral lottery.

Never! At that time it was understood that for the achievement of the social revolution it was necessary that the people find for its aspirations new forms of social organization, forms which, moreover, could not be of the representative government type, nor the governmental Jacobinism of Louis Blanc, nor a State such as was elaborated for the triumph of the Roman and Christian idea—but something quite new arising from the needs of modern production and distribution; something as different from that which exists at present as the communes of the twelfth century, described by Thierry and Sismondi, were different from the feudal world against which they revolted; something that will arise from the struggle of the workers against capital, from the national and international unions, from the common interests which exist among workers of the of the various parts of the world outside of the present political forms, from the ideas which are germinating in their minds.

That is what the International was seeking when its work was interrupted by the war of 1870.

All the workers, however, do not think in the same fashion. The great majority, on the contrary, sees nothing outside of political reforms. Many dream of dictatorship; a large number desire Jacobin terror. The great mass puts its faith in universal suffrage and in their parliamentary representatives. They do not see to what extent political liberty is restrained by economic bondage. Lodged in the tradition of 1793 and 1848, they fail to see that the industrial worker and the peasant will remain the slaves of the rich and the nobility so long as they themselves are not masters of the land, the factories and all the social wealth.

Consequently the International had to pursue a twofold aim.

In its daily life it would establish unions among men of various trades in each city, region and nation, and among all the trades internationally. And through its Congresses it would carry on propaganda work far beyond the confines of its own ranks. It would speak to the whole world and disseminate its ideas among all peoples, especially those not as yet influenced by the revolutionary vanguard of the working class.

In its Congresses the workers (and the workers only) in the various trades and from various nations would learn to know each other. They would develop mutual understanding for the purpose of insuring the success of their strikes by means of regional and international solidarity. They would learn to paralyse, to stun the capitalist monster by the power of international attack. They would know how to put it in its death throes, to make it yield to the united strength of the workers.

They would study in the meantime how to produce and distribute the products of their labor by themselves. From those understandings, renewed each year by means of international exchanges of ideas, would develop the plans for the new forms of economic organization which should eventually replace capitalist production and distribution. During this time the regional and

international Congresses would serve as a powerful medium for the propagation of the socialist idea as well as for the elaboration of new ideas.

Each Congress would decide upon two or three important problems to be studied in preparation for the following Congress. These questions would be posed and discussed, in the period between the two Congresses, at first in the local workers groups, then in small regional or national Congresses and finally in the annual international Congress.

Serious-minded men would come together and prepare elaborate reports summarizing the local and regional discussion; these reports would be used as the basis for discussion at the next Congress. After being published in the minutes they would be used as material for discussion and for propaganda in the newspapers.

No scientific congress was ever better organized in this respect than the Congresses of the International—for, this organization was not the work of a single individual, but the fruit of the collective spirit asserting itself in practice.

That is why, in the realm of everyday practical life, each Congress marked a step in advance in the establishment of mutual understanding among the various trades. One saw trades which formerly were at odds with each other—for example, the clockmakers and building workers—now united for common action; one saw nations, formerly enemies, now united to hold common council in a strike.

Likewise, each Congress marked a step in advance in the realm of ideas.

The International shattered many old prejudices. Lefrancais presented his splendid thesis against dictatorship; Liebknecht (in 1869) launched his formidable attack upon parliamentary action and against the political fakers who attempted to drag the proletariat into electoral struggles. In the sphere of economics there was, at the Lausanne Congress, in 1867, a free discussion of the public utilities and on the role of the State, on the land question at Brussels (1868), and on property at Basle (1869); each of these marked a new step in the evolution of ideas, each report being a major piece of work rising from the heart of the International

The Basle Congress was the last of this kind.

In 1870 there came the war. France raised the flag of the Commune and was bled under the heels of the French murderers as well as under the heel of Bismark. The Germans, inflamed by their military successes which they attributed to the "governmental organization" of Moltke and Bismark, to their "Discipline", to the political State, became completely enamored of governmentalism and politicalism. From being "socialist" they turned into "social-democrats", into Jacobins, into ultra-Statists.

Germany had conquered France; was that not sufficient evidence of the value of "strong government"? Socialism, therefore, required a strong government.

From then on all the Congresses, including the current fiasco in London, had as their aim *establishment of a socialist government*.

Those who believe that we are exaggerating need only to read the invectives in the social-democratic press against the anarchists who place obstacles in the way of the formation of such a government. The establishment of an international socialist government became, from that time on, the goal of all the international Congresses.

At the London Conference in 1871 the British Marxists, supported by the infamous Outin, promulgated the doctrine of "the conquest of political power" while laying down the bases of an international government.

At the Hague, in 1872, the Marxists, supported by the French Blanquists, preferred to exclude the Jura Federation and Bakunin, to split the International in two and to send the General Council to New York to die an ignominious death—"to kill the International"—rather than to see an International which (in France, Belgium, Spain, Italy and in Switzerland) did not recognize the authority of the Marxist General Council.

While the anarchists worked continually on the development of their conceptions of a society without government; while they were working out the problems and questions of production, distribution, cooperation, of the aims of production, of morality, or philosophy—the other faction remained absolutely stationary.

Since the Basle Congress twenty-eight years ago not a single idea, not a single thought which might indicate a forward step in socialist evolution, has issued from the International Congress. For to say, "Let us be numerous in Parliament and vote for an eight-hour law" is not to express an idea. This is not a contribution to the immense social problem. It is merely a pious wish, a pious fancy.

And while international Congresses of various trades are being held (such as the international Congress of glass-workers which has just ended); while international conferences (conducted without ballyhoo) of American and British longshoremen together with Belgian workers, are preparing for large-scale international action which shall reduce working hours and may perhaps lead to the seizure of the docks—while all this is taking place the international socialist Congresses (Second International) have been for the past twenty-eight years precisely what the current London Congress is: the arena for the display of personal feuds and ambitions...

The Frame-Up System

By TOM MOONEY

C. Vincent Riccardi was an active cog in the San Francisco FRAME-UP RING during the years of 1916, 17, 18 and 19 during which time that dastardly plot that has robbed me of 20 of the best and most precious years of my life was accomplished. Riccardi says the FRAME-UP SYSTEM could, would and did acquit the guilty, convict the innocent and have juries disagree when the accused still had money to pay for a second or third trial. "Suckers" were never convicted or acquitted with a penny left in their pockets or the pockets of their friends or relatives. Fatty Arbuckle is one very substantial proof of that. Three trials were required by the FRAME-UP RING to "clean" Arbuckle and his friends JUSTICE—A FIRST CLASS RACKET.

Here is how the FRAMEUP SYSTEM works: They have two types on the Jury panels that they select. They are known as convicts and acquitors. The former convicts no matter what the evidence, the latter acquits regardless

of the evidence. If you want conviction—as was desired by the Capitalist class in my case—twelve convicts are drawn for the Jury. If you desire an acquittal, twelve acquitors are placed upon the Jury. If a disagreement is desired, as it always is, where the “SUCKER” still is able to pay for a second or third trial, both convicts and acquitors are drawn for jury duty.

C. Vincent Riccardi, explains it like this: The Court clerks are a part of the FRAMEUP RING. They furnish the Boss of the FRAMEUP ring with a copy of the Jury panel which is supposed to be held inviolate—to be made known only in Court just before a trial opens. The frameup Ring, selects twelve names, sends them to the clerk of the court and asks him to have them drawn for Jury duty in a certain trial. The Clerk has 32 names on his Jury panel, the twelve names wanted for jury duty by the FRAMEUP RING in this certain trial are put into the Jury ballot drum loose, the other 20 names are tied together with a rubber band and placed in the Jury drum. The 12 loose slips are drawn in the regular manner. The trial takes place and the desired results obtained by the FRAMEUP RING. JUSTICE IS PEDDLED TO THE HIGHEST BIDDER.

Attorney C. Vincent Riccardi learned how the system worked and decided to work it alone on his own without paying tribute (splitting attorney fees) to the FRAMEUP GANG. For violating the ethics of the FRAMEUP SYSTEM'S CODE RICCARDI, HIMSELF WAS FRAMED. He was accused and convicted of embezzlement by the very same FRAMEUP SYSTEM he had so often used to acquit or convict others. He was released on bail and went secretly to the foreman of the Grand Jury and exposed the whole FRAMEUP SYSTEM. He gave the inviolate Jury panel of Judge Griffin's court to a sub-committee of three from the Grand Jury and three from the Bar Association, asked them to select any twelve names they desired, write them down and place them in a safe over night. The sub-committee knew nothing of the antecedents of any of these jurymen—Riccardi told them he would draw them first from the Jury ballot drum in Judge Griffin's Court the following morning for a case to be tried there. He told them the night before just what the verdict in that case would be the following morning—9 for acquittal and 3 for conviction no matter what the evidence showed.

The sub-committee of six from the Grand Jury and the Bar Association selected one of their members to sit in court the following morning to watch this demonstration and it turned out just as Riccardi predicted the evening before—the twelve names selected by the Grand Jury and Bar Association sub-committee were the first 12 drawn from the Jury Ballot drum and served as the Jury in that case and they disagreed 9 for acquittal and 3 for conviction. Riccardi gave his 12 names to Superior Court Clerk James Groom, and asked him to have them drawn for that Jury and Groom did that little trick with his rubber bands. Riccardi was sent to San Quentin Prison, for ten years, but stayed only ten weeks. Governor Stephens commuted his sentence to time served—to expire immediately (May 13, 1921), which left him in prison less than three months. Riccardi told the powers that be to either free him or he would expose the entire Mooney-Billings FRAMEUP as he did the rotten Jury situation in San Francisco.

While in San Quentin Prison, I had three long talks with Riccardi. He told me just how the FRAMEUP RING worked, in all cases—he told of many

things that I did not know about my Jury—he said he knew of two jurors in my case that received bribes of at least \$1300. He named them as Banks and Bussini. Riccardi immediately upon entering prison declared to me that he would not be there very long. I came back with this retort, "If you know your Mooney case, I'll say you won't stay in prison very long," to which he made this reply: "What I know about your case stands between me and liberty and I cannot tell it to you now, but some day I will tell you a story about your FRAMEUP that is so amazing that you yourself will not believe it, it is so incredible, but true. Riccardi has never kept his promise—to tell what he knows about how my Jury was hand picked, bribed and framed against me.

A facsimile of the San Francisco Bulletin for May 31, 1917, was recently published, telling of District Attorney Fickert attempt to plant one Kelly on Mrs. Mooney's Jury to insure at least disagreement.

Here is proof positive of the inviolate Jury panel being in the District Attorney's office for 24 hours before the trial started after the Judge gave strict instructions not to let any one have it until the trial started. When it was returned to Court the name of Kelly was added to it. This plant would either try to bribe the rest of the Jurors, work on them as did MacNevin on my Jury, or cause a disagreement by voting for conviction when the evidence commanded an acquittal. Kelly was one of the first to be drawn from the Jury Ballot Drum in Mrs. Mooney's trial by that tricky little rubber band used so effectively in the past by the FRAMEUP RING. Exposed, Kelly asked to withdraw from Jury service. The Bailiff and Court Clerk Butler were suspended.

Never in the whole history of criminal procedure has a more outrageous and appalling situation been revealed than that testified to in the hearing on my application for a writ of habeas corpus by Jesse Glenn Denton, brother-in-law of William V. MacNevin, Foreman of the Jury that tried Tom Mooney. MacNevin told Denton more than once before my trial started that "Mooney was convicted before the trial started because he, MacNevin, "would be on the Mooney Jury by that clever rubber band trick." That "Martin Swanson, Pacific Gas and Electric Company detective, informed District Attorney Fickert that Tom Mooney bombed the parade and should be arrested," That, "he (MacNevin) would get \$5,000 for Mooney's conviction and \$250 for each month Mooney was in prison, Fickert would become Governor, Cunha, District Attorney and MacNevin President of the Board of Police Commissioners and reinstated on the Real Estate Board from which he had been suspended for sharp practices.

"Several times before and during the Tom Mooney trial, MacNevin tried to sell me on the idea that Tom Mooney was a very dangerous character and should be done away with," said Denton. "One night during the trial of Tom Mooney, I was at MacNevin's home for dinner, the door bell rang and MacNevin went to the door, he was absent from the dinner table for 20 minutes. During his absence, I asked my sister what was detaining "Billy" so long and she replied: 'it must be Ed. Cunha, he comes out almost every night to talk the case over with 'Billy!' When MacNevin returned to the dinner table Mrs. MacNevin asked if that was Ed to see him and MacNevin said, 'yes' and I asked why he did not come in, to which MacNevin said 'don't you think he

had plenty of nerve to drive up in front of the house and talk to me in a taxi cab, let alone coming into the house.' MacNevin said 'Ed got a great kick out of it when I told him how the testimony of that big honest cattleman went over with the Jury,' I told Ed when Oxman finished testifying I turned and said to all of the jurors within hearing in the Jury box, 'who could doubt the word of that big honest cattleman and they all nodded their heads in approval'."

Denton, said to MacNevin, "I will not be a party to this outrageous and unlawful thing with knowledge of it in my possession, to which MacNevin retorted, "everything is all fixed, if anyone 'squawks,' they will be declared insane and sent to Napa."

(Reprinted from the "INDUSTRIAL WORKER")

Sanctions and The Working Class

By EMMA GOLDMAN

(EDITORS NOTE:—The following is a small portion of a letter written to us by comrade Goldman dealing with a variety of matters. She says, among other things, "I have received the October-November issue (of VANGUARD) and I consider it a vast improvement on the previous issues though they were by no means bad—If only you can all hold out VANGUARD ought to grow into an important voice of our ideas." Comrade Goldman writes that she was unable to discuss, at any length, the situation in England, because she had not been there very long and therefore could not speak authoritatively on this subject. Desiring to convey more than mere surface impressions, she promises to contribute to "Vanguard" in the very near future on the aforementioned subject. We are sure that our readers will more than welcome her highly illuminating writings.)

Once again the Anarchist position in regard to the incompetency of all government has been proven correct. Could any non-governmental group of people have made such a mess as the Laval-Hoare combine? Mr. Baldwin is like Wilson. He too promised his electors to "keep them out of war" only to plunge them to the very brink of it, soon to kick them over altogether. What is a new world slaughter if British interests in Abyssinia are at stake? Human lives were never cheaper and Colonial possessions more than ever valuable. Indeed so valuable that the British Government can well afford to make a scapegoat of a foreign minister or two, if need be. On the other hand is France terrorized by the Italian bully? Why should not the Premier be ready to satisfy his megalomania for expansion and power? Politicians and statesmen never learn anything. Else the Lavals, the Hoares and the Baldwins, and the masters whom they serve would not have taken it for granted that they can fool the masses as easily as their pre-war confreres did. Not that it will make the post-war gang in government seats wiser now that the people in England have so unanimously forced the Baldwins and Hoares to admit their criminal blunder in regard to the Italo-Abyssinian "peace" offers. But it is none the less encouraging to find the masses up in arms against the attempted gangsters deal.

For myself, I consider the whole business of sanctions a fake devised largely by this country to safeguard its own Imperialist designs. Shaw spoke wisely when he said that the English first find a principle and then nail it to the mast of ships heavily laden with whiskey and ammunition to make the savage heathens accept that principle. A fat lot England cares for the Abyssinians. It does care a great deal though to safeguard Fascism for Mussolini. It is therefore the height of stupidity to believe that Great Britain or any other strong government has any intention of enforcing sanctions. Yet the Labour Party in this country and the Communists have fallen for the bait, instead of calling upon the workers to declare an international boycott against Mussolini. That, alone, would spoil that madman's campaign and inspire the Italian masses to get rid of him and his black regime. The British transport workers have proven the force of such a stand when they refused to transport arms for the interventionists in Russia. And I am certain the same could have been achieved and more, had the British Labour Party and the French Syndicalists remained true to their claims.

As to the Communists, they must abide by Moscow's decision. And Moscow now prefers co-operation with the great powers to any support it might get from international labour. Such is the bitter irony of the Russian Revolution guillotined by "our great our wonderful our precious leader and teacher, Stalin".

London, December 24, 1935.

The Transitional Period

(Concluded)

As it was pointed out in the previous issue of "Vanguard", the realization of libertarian communism is not a matter of instantaneous social change. Great as the creative powers of the revolution might be, they cannot go beyond laying the foundation of the framework of a new society. The building up and completion of such a framework belongs already to the post-revolutionary epoch, the period of transition necessary for the purposes of reeducating the young generation, liquidating the coercive functions within society and integrating agriculture and industry into higher structural units.

This, however, is by no means equivalent to the Marxist idea of dictatorship of the proletariat. The idea of a transitional period demands, first of all, a consistent application to the entire field of revolutionized social relationships, while the Marxist scheme exempts from such application the all important sphere of political life. For it is one thing to admit the gradual nature of the process of eradication of authoritarian forms from the post-revolutionary social order, and quite another to pursue the policy of utmost strengthening such authoritarian forms in the utopian hope of their automatic dissolution in a new economic order. To consider the extreme authoritarian forms of political life implied in the Marxist scheme of dictatorship of the proletariat as transitional links between the rough political framework produced by the revolution and the ultimate stage of a non-authoritarian society, is to misconstrue entirely the idea of the transitional period.

The latter is by no means an idea of simple social mechanics. It does not mean that all we have to do is to get hold of some primary lever, the economic factor in the case, and manipulate it in such a fashion as to insure an automatic sliding of the new social order into the mold of a libertarian society. That the economic and political factors stand in relation of primary and secondary agencies is altogether a highly debatable question, but whatever such relationship might be, they are certainly not of the kind which reduces the political factor to a mere reflex, shadow, following automatically the movements of the primary economic factor. And inasmuch as the necessity of a *creative* adjustment between those two factors is admitted, it follows that every stage of development of transitional economy must be matched by corresponding forms of transitional political institutions. It means that instead of a fatalistic reliance upon an automatic process of dissolution of authoritarian forms in the new economic order, an active policy of combatting them must be pursued, a policy of evolving such political forms for the transitional period which in themselves would represent a significant step in the direction of a free society.

The nature of such transitional political forms was already forecast by Proudhon in his great work "Le Principe Federatif". This book in itself came as a realization of the necessity of concretizing in political terms the oft repeated idea of a gradual liquidation of the State in the new economic organism. It contains one of the most fertile ideas of political thought, acknowledged as such by the most progressive political thinkers of today and given subsequent development in their works. It is the principle of a new federalism based upon the widest dispersion among the genuinely social organizations of all the functions and responsibilities that at the present are monopolized by the State. It does not deny the need for coordination and integration of all those widely distributed social activities and functions, but it rejects the fallacious idea of producing such an integrated social will through the instrumentality of a centralized State, that is an agency set apart from the various functional social organizations, laying its origin to an allegedly superior principle of manifestation of general will and exercising sovereign powers in virtue thereof.

The idea of a new federalism took on a new aspect in the works of Kropotkin who proved that the course of any spontaneous social process, undistorted by the abnormal factors underlying the emergence of the modern State, follows the line of development plotted by the theoretical analysis and speculations of Proudhon and the progressive political scientists of today. And great revolutions being the highest manifestation of the spontaneous social spirit, it follows that they must tend toward political forms giving expression to this principle of a new federalism. They must inevitably conflict with the basic principle of the State whose triumph in the past represented the reversal of the tendency characterizing the high tension of creative energies attained by the revolution. This was true of the great revolutions in the past and it will hold even more so with the greater revolutions that are to come in the near future. In their first, most creative period, at least, those revolutions will transcend the limitations of the State principle, and unless thwarted by the triumph of some Jacobin power-usurping party, they will tend to carry over into the subsequent period of post-revolutionary reconstruction the basic features of a federalistic political structure carved out by the tremendous outburst of its creative energies.

Federalism, of course, does not connote the total absence of coercion. Apart from the defense purposes arising in the process of self-preservation on the part of the revolution, coercion will also be used for the purposes of coordination of the various functional activities in accordance with some sort of a unified plan of a socialized economy. Emanating, however, from the functional organizations themselves, which in their organizational aspect of coordination give as adequate an expression of the general will of society as it is possible to attain, such coercion must inevitably tend to the zero point in measure that a spontaneous social solidarity becomes the cementing link between the ever more harmonized functional activities of society. That even such limited use of coercion contains its dangers tending towards expansion and usurpation, that the eradication of even those moderate forms of authority will not be an altogether smooth process, that, of course, is known to every libertarian. But from the point of view of realistic revolutionary possibilities even this hedging in of a coercion by natural limits of a federalistic political structure is a tremendously difficult, although by no means utopian, task. To force it into the marginal position of an occasional cementing link is an altogether different thing from making coercion the only instrumentality of effecting revolutionary changes as it is now being done in Russia.

Corresponding to the compromise in the political field represented by the political structure of the new federalism, a similar realistic approach must also be evolved in the economic field. A full hundred percent realization of communism being impossible during the first period of post-revolutionary reconstruction, it devolves upon the revolutionary forces to work out a scheme of partial realization of communism based upon a realistic appraisal of each branch of revolutionary economy. That some measure of communistic distribution will have to be incorporated into the transitional economy is an elementary idea following on one hand from the nature of the present day technical development and on the other from the drive for justice initiated by the revolution. Without applying the principle of communistic distribution to the basic necessities of life, the development of revolutionary economy in the more technically advanced countries will be seriously clogged up. It is only in backward countries like Soviet Russia that industrialization could supply sufficient motive power for the expansion of the economy without having to broaden at the same time its consumptive basis. In the technically advanced countries the broadening of the consumptive basis constitutes a prime necessity. (It will soon become the same in Soviet Russia upon the completion of her industrialization program.) The socialization of economy does not change matters in that respect. In order to keep the wheels of socialized industry turning, the elementary needs of the members of the community must be gratified in full and that means communistic distribution securing to everyone the full gratification of his basic needs.

It means that in respect of distribution the transition economy will be of a two-fold character; communistic in respect to basic necessities and collectivist to the rest. This alone will necessitate some medium of measuring the equivalent of social energy contained in the products. Without such a yardstick the economy assumes the barbarous aspects which made communism so odious to many a liberal and libertarian thinker, that is, the loss of the right to dispose of one's income, the tyranny of the collective (and in Soviet Russia of the bureaucratic State official) in imposing its standards upon the consumer.

It is clear, however, that it is not the communistic principle of distribution in itself that produces that dreadful loss of elementary rights on the part of the individual. Communism means merely taking the needs and not the measure of one's contributions as the basis of distribution. It can go hand in hand with a certain kind of money payments which would retain for the consumer the rights to exercise by choice and dictate his tastes to industry. The elementary task of the revolutionary forces is to find such a measurement of social energy which would make possible the communistic distribution of basic necessities in accordance with abstract measurement of value and not a mere quantitative inventory of goods. A lump sum given to every individual for the gratification of his basic needs and expressed in terms of such measuring units would go a long way in solving the basic difficulties of communistic distribution.

Not only would it remove all the objectionable features of a communist economy, but it would prove to be indispensable in the organization of an equitable form of relationship between the socialized section of the revolutionized economy and the numerous oases of individual economy which, as it was already pointed out, can only be gradually integrated into a socialized economy. An equitable relationship does not imply an exchange of products on the basis of individual labor equivalent which would simply confer a premium upon the social wastage involved in the background individual economy. Equity under present conditions demands price control and regulation of output, but when that is done on the basis of fiat state money or the inadequate standards of metallic money, it opens wide the door to colonial exploitation of the kind which is practised and advocated by Soviet Russia in regard to the present economy. On the other hand, an exchange medium based upon scientific measurement of social energy in producing articles for use and commodities of the still existing individual economy would show clearly the debt owed by the backward type of economy to the more advanced, thus facilitating the organization of a controlled exchange between the two, based upon a scientifically established price and a production placed within the frame of a general plan.

What are, then, the general features of the transitional social structure? (This article does not aim at more than making a few suggestions in this respect). They are: A federative structure on the political side on the one hand, differing from the Marxist scheme not only in its total rejection of any Party control, but in representing in itself a significant step in the direction of a non-authoritarian society. On the economic side we would have a basic communism, that is, the principle of communistic distribution prevailing only in the limited field of elementary necessities such as food, clothing and shelter. It will be an ever widening field, embracing new branches of economy in measure that they are transferred into the range of abundance in production. The economy of basic communism would have to be coordinated with a collectivist economy on the one hand and the rudiments of individual economy on the other. The coordination demands, first of all, a scientifically established currency measuring the social energy contained within the products. In addition, a scientific plan of control and regulation would have to be worked out for the individual economies, a plan based not upon political expediency and doctrinaire consideration, but upon the broad principles of social equity, that is, the principle of equal contribution and sharing on the great collective enterprise.

SENEX.

Who are the Progressives in the A. F. of L.?

SIDNEY HILLMAN, President of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. The University of Chicago honored him by endowing a chair called "The Sidney A. Hillman Scholarship in Industrial Cooperation". He regarded the N. R. A. as a "dream come true", and declared at a convention of his union, May 14th, 1934, that, "As chief of your organization I consider that I serve the interest of your organization best by serving the entire labor movement through the N. R. A. in the capacity of a member of the labor advisory board". Through the Amalgamated banks Mr. Hillman loaned large sums to clothing firms, and introduced a system of speed-up and efficiency in production which earned him the praise of the employers. He developed the theory that the unions should go into partnership with the employers and by mutual assistance give the clothing manufacturers a chance to do the right thing by the unions. He declared in the *Daily News Record* of Sept. 20, 1934 that, "The idea of labor partnership in the mens clothing industry is something more than a mere abstraction. The clothing firm of Straus and Co. of San Francisco is a case in point. The workers in this shop went on strike for an increase in wages. The firm declared that they were in a very bad financial position and could not pay the increase that the workers demanded. The union came to the assistance of the boss and advanced money to save the firm and purchase new machinery. The workers were forced to go back to work with no increase in wages, and were told to speed up production. Prof. R. Commons of the University of Wisconsin in discussing the possibilities of cooperation between Capital and Labor, lauds Hillman's efforts in this field and points out that the union saved a firm from bankruptcy by a 40% increase in production. In many cases the union voluntarily accepted wage cuts for "the good of the Industry". It is therefore not suprising when the employers declared that, "Mr. Hillman enjoys the respect and confidence of the employers who have dealt with him".

DAVID DUBINSKY, President of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. A close collaborator of Hillman in the N. R. A. This progressive displayed his solidarity by refusing to go on strike in support of the shipping clerks and elevator operators who were on strike in the garment district. This was done against the will of the rank and file who were forced to act as scabs. Hillman and Dubinsky are on very good terms with the bosses and often appear at banquets given by the employers. Like Hillman, Dubinsky believes that strikes are to be avoided in favor of mutual understandings with the employers' organization. They also believe in expelling "troublemakers from the union". Together with the Jewish Daily Forward and the politicians of the Socialist Party they use the unions to further their own reactionary ends.

JOHN L. LEWIS, President of the United Mine Workers of America. This "progressive leader" sent his gunman to help the Peabody Coal Co. shoot down striking coal miners. The miners protested against a wage settlement made without their consent. The settlement called for five dollars a day, a dollar less than the independent operators agreed to pay. When the miners picketed the Peabody Coal Co. the company guards assisted by the Lewis gunmen shot down the militant workers. This is only one of many outrages, such as investing 150,000 dollars of union funds in a scab coal company

in West Virginia, that led to many revolts against the Lewis machine. These revolts were suppressed in blood by Lewis and his friends, the coal barons who fear revolutionary unionism as much as the Lewis machine does.

His United Mine Workers which he regards as the model of real industrial unionism, is divided into districts and sub-districts ruled by gangsters and political fascist unions of Germany or Italy. He is, of course, an ardent friend of the N. R. A. and believes in harmony between capitol and labor.

CHARLES P. HOWARD, President of the International Typographical Union, the most exclusive job trust in this country. His union was the only one that refused to join the San Francisco general strike. They scabbed and printed all the lies, slanders and bloodthirsty attacks of the yellow press of San Francisco. They thus helped to undermine the morale of the strikers, and incited the vigilantes to attack the workers.

McMAHON and GORMAN. These leaders of the United Textile Workers shamelessly betrayed one of the finest strikes in the history of the labor movement. At the behest of Roosevelt and the arbitration board he called off the strike of the textile workers without consulting the membership, which was steadily gaining more and more support. This action prevented the organization of the industry and gave the bosses the upper hand against the workers.

When such corrupt fakers suddenly blossom forth as "Progressive" one asks, why this sudden change?

The great wave of organization which took place at the inception of the N. R. A. resulted in an influx of members into the A. F. of L. They expected the A. F. of L. to help them in their militant strikes for a better life. However the militant attempts of the workers were sabotaged by the leadership of the organization. The A. F. of L., true to its tradition and practice of harmony between capitol and labor, supported the N. R. A. and trusted to the arbitration boards, the graveyard of workers bones, to rule in favor of labor.

Sydney Hillman, McGrady (one of the vice-presidents) of the A. F. of L. and many others prominent in the labor movement joined the staff of the government. The issue of growing militancy, the beginning of sharpened class struggles, were sidetracked by the A. F. of L. into the channel of government collaboration, a dangerous fascist current.

The disillusionment was hastened by the sell-out of the great textile strike of 1933; the refusal of the officials to support the San Francisco General Strike; the expulsion of many thousands of militant workers from the A. F. of L. The workers saw their best efforts gone to naught, saw themselves sold out and bargained away at the conference boards by their officials. It took the collapse of the N. R. A. to complete this process of disillusionment of the workers in the A. F. of L.

The A. F. of L. stands clearly exposed to millions of workers. It proved itself absolutely unfit to crystalize the growing militancy of the aroused workers. Workers are determined to get organized; they are becoming more militant daily; the demand for revolutionary unions expresses itself in the organization of independent unions, into the I. W. W. and in the open revolts of the rank and file of the workers in the A. F. of L. itself.

These gropings in the direction class-conscious unionism spell the doom of the A. F. of L. which continues on its downward course of impotence and degeneracy. The "progressives" in the A. F. of L. are well aware of this. They are afraid that the working class will organize outside of and in opposition to the A. F. of L. They are afraid that their long and profitable careers of betrayal are about to end.

Howard of the typographical union sounded the alarm in his speech at the last convention when he said: "the workers of this country are going to organize, if they are not permitted to organize under the banners of the A. F. of L. They are going to organize under some other leadership or they are going to organize without leadership. And if either of those conditions should eventuate, I submit to you that it would be a far more serious problem for our government, for the people of this country and for the A. F. of L. itself than if our organization should be so molded that we can organize them under the leadership of this organization".

How to capitalize this growing sentiment for organization without losing control of the unions? How to direct the growing militancy of the workers into the safe channel of the conservative A. F. of L.? The only solution that the progressives can find for this problem is to throw a sop to the workers in the form of unions like the United Miners, in the mass production industries only. (They do not intend to interfere with the existing craft unions.) No really important changes are contemplated. As the Lewis machine has demonstrated, it is just as easy to control so-called "industrial" unions, like the United Mine Workers as it is for Hillman and Dubinsky to control the garment unions.

The trend of the labor movement, however, is toward revolutionary unionism. This means recognition of the class struggle, militant direct action, the institution of workers democracy, the destruction of gangsterism and bureaucracy in any form. It is this that the A. F. of L. is trying to sidetrack, because this change, as the "progressives" admit, means the destruction of the A. F. of L.

The issue of "progressivism" in the A. F. of L. cannot therefore be regarded as furthering the interests of the workers. The process of radicalization of the American Labor movement leads away from the A. F. of L. Intelligent revolutionary workers should mercilessly expose the true nature of A. F. of L. "progressivism", expose the bankruptcy of the A. F. of L. and work for the establishment of revolutionary industrial unionism in this country.

S. WEINER.

Social Security A La Townsend

Even though the demagogues of the Townsend movement may talk of their "heaven-sent" plan as "the cure for all economic and spiritual ills", it cannot be laughed off as just another fantastic cure-all or fad that will soon die a natural death. The Townsend old-age revolving-pension plan is the latest and most popular of the recent schemes invented to attract those millions of declassed, pauperized middle class and working class people who are beginning consciously and articulately to demand a minimum of economic security from the society in which they live. It is this group of people which the

vanguard of the working class must educate to see the fallacies of such preposterous schemes; they must be activated in class conscious unions, co-operatives, etc., to fight for their elementary rights in the only way in which they can get them; they must not be permitted to swing the balance of power in favor of fascism when the critical moment arrives.

The supporters of the Townsend plan expect it to yield returns in a very short time. And when viewed superficially and uncritically it has a captivating ring. Under its provisions each person over sixty years of age will receive a pension of two hundred dollars a month from the Federal Government which he or she must spend within the month on commodities. The pension fund, which amounts to about twenty or twenty-five billion dollars a year, is to be raised by means of a two percent tax on all business and financial transactions. The circulation of the pension money which is to be spent on commodities will, according to Dr. Townsend and his followers, so stimulate business that America will enter into an era of prosperity such as she has never before seen.

We can assume for the moment that the sponsors of the plan are sincere and will really try to carry out its provisions as per blue print. Without going into all its ramifications, let us trace some of the possible developments in the economic life of the United States if the Townsend plan were approved by Congress and its provisions carried out at once. According to the latest program of the worthy doctor, about seven or eight billion dollars would have to be raised within four months (the initial preparatory period) in order to begin pension payments on a sound financial basis. Where, precisely, will this money come from? Will the burden of the two percent transactions tax fall on the shoulders of the producers of raw material, the manufacturers, the middlemen, the financiers and retailers upon whom the tax is originally levied or will the tax accumulate all along the line and be added to the price the consumer must pay to the retailer? It is plain that even the most stringent law could not possibly force the owners of capital to assume this burden, and they will do as they have always done in such cases, that is, add the tax to the cost of production and pass it on to the consumer.

This means that in a period of four months the cost of living will be increased by about twenty percent. But the effects of this tax on the masses of the people will be even worse than this rise in the cost of living might indicate. Those business enterprises organized on a "vertical" basis (firms controlling production from raw material to the finished product) will not have to pay as high a tax as the horizontal corporations and the vast number of smaller business enterprises but will nevertheless, according to the good old economic law, set prices almost as high as those of their "less efficient" competitors. The present monopolies and trusts will be strengthened and new monopolies will be formed so that commodities in their trips from producer to consumer will not have to pass thru so many economic hands and in that manner quite a number of "transactions" will be eliminated.

We need not at this point enter into the many and varied dangerous potentialities of this tremendously accelerated growth of private monopoly capital. Nor is it necessary to describe the many other economic dangers which the "transactions" tax will inflict on the working masses. Suffice it

to point out that before any of the possible benefits of the plan can be realized the masses will have suffered the effects of an enormous increase in the cost of living.

The four months preparatory period is now over and the pension payments are begun. We assume of course that the Townsend Plan has not as yet been abandoned as the result of popular protest. The first question that arises is whether each pensioner can be forced to spend all of his two hundred dollars each month. Numerous schemes have already been devised to circumvent this provision of the plan. One of the schemes suggests that the recipients of the pension can swap payments and then spend as much as they see fit. The most efficient army of spies and snoopers will not be able to force the old people to spend the entire amount of their pensions. We see then, that the possibilities of an improvement in business resulting from the increase in sales of commodities to pensioners are diminished in two ways. First, the entire pension will not be spent. Second, the amount spent will be smaller in actual buying power because of the inflationary rise in prices. But even if there is some increase in the sale of commodities it does not follow that prosperity will come back. However, the total amount that could possibly be spent in a month will not be nearly as high as the amount of income lost indirectly by the vast majority of Americans in the form of higher living costs. Moreover, an improvement in business is not necessarily followed by an improvement in the standard of living of the working masses. It is common knowledge that during the past year (1935) although the profits of leading corporations have risen enormously, the real wages of workers have remained almost stationary.

But such an analysis of the fallacies of their plan cannot disturb the Townsendites. To every objection put forth they answer by changing their plans. The latter have been even more numerous and varied than Hitler's programs for the salvation of Germany. Originally the pension fund was to be raised by a sales tax. The bluntness of this method of taking money from the masses of the people caused them to shift to the advocacy of the more subtle transactions tax. The McGroarty old age pension bill which they are supporting in Congress contains this joker: The pension is "not to exceed \$200" (This can mean a pension of anything from one cent to two hundred dollars.) However, whatever plan they may see fit to propose, it always provides for the partial confiscation, by taxation, of the wealth of the masses of people in order to turn it over to a small section of the population; or else it requires the complete expropriation of the capitalist class. Either possibility is out of the question. The first is obviously undesirable and the second obviously impossible under capitalism; the capitalist class will not make such laws as will relieve them of their own property (and they do indeed play a very important part in making the laws of the land) nor will they permit others (perhaps socialistically minded Congressmen) to pass such laws without putting up so much resistance that it would require a social revolution to overcome it. This, we might say, is the basic fallacy of all the "adequate social insurance" laws proposed in capitalist countries, including the Lundeen Bill so vociferously sponsored by the Communist Party.

For working class parties to attempt to unite with the Townsend movement and others of its kind for the purpose of achieving social legislation is to acquire their utopian plans and futile methods. The Communist Party in proposing a united front with them is thereby not only helping to maintain the backwardness and gullibility of millions of potentially progressive people but is also lending moral support to an unprincipled group of politicians who control the Townsend organization by completely undemocratic methods. (Michael Gold in the *New Masses* of Jan. 21, 1936, proposes unity with the "Townsendites, Epic Leagues, etc. . . . all the scattered forces of real democracy." The extent of democracy in the Townsend organization can be judged by the following facts—a mere glimpse of the actual situation: Its constitution prevents all important by-laws from being amended. All clubs which put up a kick against this dictatorial procedure were expelled. The national executive determines all policies. When one of the local organizations tried to lobby Congress on its own it was stopped by the rulers of the organization who issued an edict stating that a new method for handling Congress during its next session had been adopted by the national executive and that no local or state organization would be allowed to send any of its own lobbyists to Washington. Their publication, the *Townsend Weekly*, is owned exclusively by Dr. Townsend and his partner Mr. Clements. Although the latter admitted that the paper showed a profit of \$300 a week, Congressman McGroarty asserted that the paper netted Dr. Townsend and Mr. Clements \$2000 a week. This is besides many other lucrative sources of income which the Townsend clubs afford).

Most of the current movements for social security advocate to some extent the principle of basic communism, the principle that society should provide for at least the elementary needs of all the people. But promises to provide some degree of basic communism can be made by anyone. These progressive aspirations are important foundations for the growth of the revolutionary movement but they can easily be utilized by the fascists if those who are ready to concretize these aspirations are allowed to remain under the influence of demagogues, if they are left in their present state of ignorance of the simplest economic and political principles, if they are not drawn into active fights for their elementary rights by the trade unions and cooperatives, if they do not learn to rely more and more on their own initiative and their own organizations. Those working class organizations which teach their adherents to follow the leader will discover, when it will be too late, that the fascists are much more adept at this game than they are.

S. MORRISON.

Which Way for the Negro?

The present economic depression has served to call attention once more to the many ways in which the negro has, for too long, been the "football" of our economic system. While his traditional role as "the last to be hired and first to be fired" was formerly confined, for the most part, to private industry, it has now taken unto itself official sanction in that the Federal government has set up a vicious, if indirect, system of discrimination against negro workers.

In its relief program in various parts of the country, this policy has been assisted, and often even promulgated, by local relief authorities.

The failure of the Federal government to set up non-discriminatory standards in the administration of relief indicates, in a larger sense, not only that legislation is powerless in directing public opinion toward better and higher standards of living and of "economic ethics", but that negro and white liberals who still look forward to Federal legislation as the means of eradicating lynching and other evils are barking up the wrong tree. Seventy years experience with flagrant violation of the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the constitution still finds this large segment of our population groping for legislative "safeguards" to "liberty".

But there is a still more important question to the so-called negro problem in America. That question is, "Is there a way out?"

For too long now, the world in general and America in particular have looked upon the problem not only as being merely racial, but also as one from which the negro alone suffers and that he alone must solve. While that attitude is gradually being changed, the full impact of racial prejudice and discrimination on the whole fabric of American civilization is not yet fully realized. Let us consider briefly a single instance of this impact: the economic situation in the South today.

The economic condition of the south today can not be blamed upon a single fact, or indeed, upon a local situation alone. The international aspects of unemployment and depression are coming more and more to be realized by thinking people, and the fallacy of working out a local or even national panacea for permanent economic readjustment is obvious. But, to increase the intensity of an already unfortunate state of existence, the south has insisted—as much in formulating current relief programs and social security aims as its industrialists and agriculturists have done in general since the Civil War—upon keeping down its own standard of living by increasing the differential between the standards for whites and negroes, the temporary advantage (to look at the problem in terms of generations to come) naturally being taken by the white group.

To call the American viewpoint or the southern viewpoint myopic is not, however, a way to social regeneration. And so the question postulated above will remain unanswered by the New Deal or any of its successors taking so narrow a view of economics. It can be seen readily, that living conditions cannot be improved for one large segment of a population at the expense of the other so-called "inferior" segment, without obliging this self-same process eventually to hamper the real economic development of all groups, even if they could all live side by side without social intercourse or contact, a possibility which is not admitted. The restriction of the purchasing power of the "inferior" group is bound to react upon the economic milieu, since lower wages mean not only lower standards of living, but lower returns in taxes and living expenditures.

Enforced "social" isolation does not separate the negro (or any other group) from the weave of the economic fabric. This need not be stressed at too great length here. We are, however concerned that both white and black Americans begin thinking more concretely than ever that salvation for both groups lies,

and alone lies, in constructive alliance of those who suffer, on the white side, from the greed of industrial and financial America (with all the hidden overtones of race, class and religious prejudice operating even against this group), and on the negro side from special difficulties confronting the black man in America.

The negro, perhaps more so than any other part of our population, is an ardent lover of liberty. Although he is not afraid of arduous labor (as witness his endurance of the rigors of slavery, as well as his servitude since that era ended), he cannot at this late date become enthusiastic for a "democracy" in which only a few of his demagogue have had any share and these only as political spoilsmen. Especially distasteful to the negro's love of liberty would be the advent of a dictatorship—be it Fascist, Communist or Monarchist.

We are not disposed to argue here in favor of libertarian communism, the doctrine to which the writer subscribes. Other articles in this magazine have ably discussed the tenets of this philosophy. We, do, however, believe that a greater understanding of its economic philosophy and social program would help clarify the negro's thinking about his future in the structure of America and of the world in general.

It is also to be hoped that the libertarian communists will, without adopting the ballyhoo methods of certain other radical groups, find means of conveying their doctrines to the negro masses. Among this group will be found many more who are waiting for an opportunity to join hands with the liberty-loving and liberty-practicing revolutionary vanguard.

GEORGE CREIGHTON.

From Our Mail Box

QUESTION:—Do the libertarian-Communists believe in class struggle?

ANSWER:—Yes, they do. They believe in the class struggle as one of the great moving forces of the life of humanity in the past and the present. They do not however, attribute to it the exclusive and primary role which the Marxists assign to it. They do not for instance, deduce liberty from the class struggle. That is, while they hold that every libertarian struggle must necessarily bear the impress of class realities in which it has to assert itself, they do not reduce it to a mere reflex of the latter. There are fundamental processes in the life of humanity which are, of course, correlated with the class struggle, but are altogether independent as to their origin. And one of such independent factors is the autonomous growth and expansion of the individual, finding its expression in the widening of scope of free activities altogether exempted from any control of society. Libertarian communism as a distinct ideal arose from the realization of the necessity of giving articulate expression to both those fundamental factors of historic life—class struggle and the growth of the individual, conceived not in their isolation but as the two coordinates along which the line humanity has been moving until now.

QUESTION:—In the July-August issue of Vanguard (Vol. II. No. 4) you attacked the idea of nationality and national aspirations. Don't you think that it would be a much sounder policy to recognize the deep rooted nature of such a fact as national aspirations and to make it instrumental for the realization of communism, as the Communist Party is doing it now in Soviet Russia?

ANSWER:—Nationalism is a deep rooted fact, but so is capitalism and even more so religious superstition. However, deeply a social fact may be lodged in the historic past, it cannot be justified on that score only. We accept or reject social facts only in measure that they agree with the universal aspirations of humanity for a better future. And it is our opinion that the national ideal cannot be harmonized with such aspirations, that even in its most positive aspect, which in itself is but of a tenth rate value, it is due to a pathological state on the part of humanity, characterized by a fragmentized memory of its past. The recovery from this state of amnesia, the regaining by humanity of the memory of its total past is now rapidly under way, which means that the total elimination of whatever value there has been in the national ideal.

Nor do we deem the national policy of the Communist Party worthy of emulation. The dangerous centrifugal tendencies released by such a policy are held in check by the vigorously centralized apparatus, and only from time to time we hear the underground rumblings of nationalist revolts. All this centralized apparatus has succeeded in doing thus far is to drive those tendencies deeply underground, to postpone the day of their final outbreak, which will be just as disruptive of the integrity of a socialist economy as it is of the attempts to break through the vicious cycle of our present day degrading economy.

QUESTION:—The stand taken by your publication (Vanguard, Vol. II, No. 4) on the question of the value of colony building seems to me to be quite dogmatic. You disapprove it on an allegedly iron-proof logic, but why not in life itself? Isn't a living experiment superior to any logical proof, and doesn't the value of colony building lie exactly in the fact that it tries to solve social questions by experiments and not by arguments only?

ANSWER:—There is too much superstitious awe about the word experiment. The value of the latter is undeniable, but it is obtained only when the experiment itself is placed within a certain logical frame. An experiment must come as an attempt to answer a certain problem, it cannot be indefinitely pursued, without taking stock of all the previous failures and without introducing a certain variant in each and every attempt.

This is exactly what is lacking in the latest attempts at colony building. The history of such attempts, for almost a century, to solve the social problem via colony building has clearly shown the futility of such a method. To keep on repeating the same attempts without an intelligent appraisal of all the numerous failures in the past is not to uphold the right to experiment, but to insist upon one's right to escape to the hard facts of social struggle into the world of wishful belief. We grant such right to the weak, infirm, to the tired radical, to the escapists. But we do deny such right to the revolutionary whose main weapon is an unflagging will and an unblunted sense of reality.

Left Winds In Spain

The political pendulum in Spain is again swinging leftward, following the wave of reaction after the two years of left republican-socialist rule which brought disillusionment to the Spanish masses.

Even the reactionaries admit that there is a left trend among the masses and the lower middle class. For although the republican-socialist rule failed to improve the lot of the workers and poor peasants, conditions today are infinitely worse. Unemployment has increased considerably, the middle classes are crushed by taxation, and many of the liberal laws enacted by the Constituent Assembly have been either repealed outright or made inoperative.

A monster mass-meeting was held in October in Madrid, where nearly half a million people gathered to hear Azaña, who has the official support of the Communist Party, the Socialist Party (the three factions), the Syndicalist Party (Pestaña's creation), and the republicans of the left.

For all the left support, the speech of Azaña was most disappointing for anybody with the honest left inclinations. He criticized the present rulers, but he himself promised nothing save a mild New Deal, and took the opportunity to state quite emphatically that he was not socialist *nor* socialistic. I wonder what the communists and socialists, who sat on the same platform with the butcher of Casas and Viejas (there was a time when the communists, in common with the anarchists, indulged in calling Azaña such) thought of his "constructive" speech.

Several hundred anarchists and syndicalists have been released lately. But court-martials of participants in the October revolution continue, resulting in many long prison sentences and some death sentences.

There is a general feeling that new elections will bring an overwhelming victory for the left parties, which are more or less committed to declare an amnesty, and for that reason some non-political workers who never believed in the ballot are in favor of voting this time as an expedient to bring about the release the 30,000 or more political prisoners. The communists and socialists are going even further. They hold meetings together with the Republicans and are becoming rather "respectable" as you will gather from the following quotation from "El Heraldo de Madrid" reporting on a "united front meeting".... It reads: "*At that moment there appeared on the stage the tricolor flag of the Spanish Republic escorted by two young socialists and two young communists. The audience, standing, gives them an enthusiastic ovation*".

Lacking space, I shall leave the comments to the reader.

Several reports have appeared in the yellow press to the effect that C. N. T. (the anarcho-syndicalist trade-union federation of Spain) is uniting with the leftist political groups for the purpose of electing a leftist government. These reports are unfounded. Before the C. N. T. would take a step of that kind, it would first hold a national convention and referendum. No convention has been held recently nor has any referendum been taken on the question.

Perhaps the reporters are confusing the C. N. T. with the reformist Syndicalists Party under the leadership of Pestana. The Syndicalist Party, a small political clique, did enter into this political united front.

ONOFRE DALLAS.

The United Front In France

The unification of the C. G. T. (General Confederation of Labor, Socialist) and the C. G. T. U. (Communist Labor Unions) is being ratified by the local unions, district and industrial federations. At this writing most of the industrial federations have approved the united front and made the necessary steps towards unification. The most important of these is the Teachers' Federation and the Federation of Railway Workers. The amalgamation of the teachers was carried out on the basis of old C. G. T. because the communist teacher's union had very little influence in the educational institutions in France.

At the unification of the railway workers the communists succeeded in putting over their program. This was not a victory over the class enemy, but a victory over the class struggle spirit of the workers.

L'Humanite, chief communist organ, glorifies this victory as follows: "By a majority of over thirty thousand the railway workers declared that no one need be alarmed over the political and electoral mandates, and those who got them (political jobs and offices) will not thereby lose the confidence of the workers." In other words, the amalgamation of industrial and political functions is allowed. Two hundred and seventy-nine unions with over 82,000 votes voted for, and 354 unions with 51,000 votes voted against the resolution calling for the double (political and industrial) functions. The communist railway worker Semar stated at the Congress that, "this resolution is a crushing blow against Anarcho-Syndicalism." By implication he admitted that the consistent defenders of revolutionary unionism are the Anarcho-Syndicalists.

The official organ of the C. G. T. "*Le peuple*", expresses great disappointment over the fact that the iron workers voted in favor of double functions; that a man can be an official in the union while occupying a seat in Parliament. "*Le Peuple*" warns the workers that they will pay heavily for this unconsidered action.

Thru the recognition of double functions the communists have succeeded in introducing a principle which up till now was never permitted and was fought in the French labor movement. It is now possible for party leaders to occupy responsible positions in the labor unions. The Communist Party has at last succeeded in doing that which they have failed to do since 1921 that is, to dominate the labor movement by committing it to the program of a political party.

The original principles of C. G. T. excluded affiliation with or domination by political parties. In all its history the C. G. T. has succeeded in remaining independent of political parties. This is not true in other countries. In England the trade unions are bound to the Labor Party, in the Scandinavian countries the same situation exists to a lesser degree. It is because the C. G. T. has abandoned its original principles and is to a certain degree influenced by the Social-

ists that the Communists were able to step in on the pretext that they desire to save the union in the interest of the proletariat.

Only a revolutionary trade union movement can hope to rid the labor movement of politicians and demagogues, a labor movement which possesses its own social revolutionary ideal, and its own syndicalist industrial program and direct action tactics.

The Syndicalists in France, the home of revolutionary Syndicalism, have a movement with such program, tactics and ideals. If the C. G. T. had not departed from its original principles and position, the prospects for the victory of the working class would be much brighter.

A. SOUCHY.

The Libertarian Movement In Japan

(EDITOR'S NOTE:—*This report from our Japanese comrades shows that a real revolutionary movement is struggling against Japanese imperialism and we feel that they will in time exercise a great influence over the revolutionary development. We salute them!*)

At midnight of November 11-12, 1935 the headquarters of the Free National Federation of Trade Unions at Kanda, Tokio, was stormed by a band of armed policemen who arrested some ten comrades and seized all the documents in the office. On the same night the officers of the League for Free Culture at Suginimi, The General Kroean Workers Union at Honjo and of all other trade unions and cooperatives of a libertarian tendency, were raided. Some 60 anarchists and syndicalists were rounded up in Tokio. Wholesale arrests of Anarchists took place in Osaka, Kyoto, Kobe and other places, one hundred Anarchists were arrested. The Free National Federation of Trade Unions is the only trade union organization in Japan which opposes capitalism, militarism and imperialism. It is upholding the principle of class struggle and libertarian Socialism, and this is why the Japanese government is doing its utmost to exterminate this movement.

We will, we are sure, be able to report in the near future the revival of our movement and the reorganization of The Free National Federation of Trade Unions. We will carry on the work of reorganization with unabated vigor, the present catastrophe notwithstanding.

Book Review

"KARL MARX: HIS LIFE" by Franz Mehring

International Publishers, 1935

Franz Mehring's book on the life of Karl Marx, recently published in the English language, was hailed by many a reviewer as an example of objective biography writing. And, indeed, compared to the crass idolatry characterizing most of the biographies of Marx written by Marxists, Mehring's book

gives the impression of a dispassionate and unbiased study of Marx's life. Marx is not pictured as the chosen prophet of a newly revealed religion, infallibility is not claimed for every letter of his writing or every single move in his political struggles. There is an attempt to rise above the sacrosanct official legend, to dispense with iconography, to do justice to Marx's outstanding adversaries like Proudhon, Bakunin, and Lassalle, so much traduced and maligned in the official Marxist histories.

All that is quite a laudable achievement, considering the fact that the author was himself one of the pillars of Marxist orthodoxy (which, of course, did not save him from the same ferocious assaults when he refused, as he himself expressed it, "to kow-tow to the official legend".) But in itself it does not make good biography. What prevents it from being such is the timid, half-hearted manner in which Mehring proceeds to debunk this official legend. That there were deep shadows in Marx's character he admits, but instead of explaining or presenting them in their natural proportions, so as to give a lifelike portrait of Marx, he fell upon the simple expedient of subduing, toning down, retouching. The fierce rancor shown by Marx toward any opponent of prominence, the unscrupulous methods employed in combatting them are facts of common knowledge which Mehring in his capacity as an objective historian could not disclaim. But instead of tracing the psychologic root of those darker sides of Marx's character (which do not belie his greatness in other respects) Mehring minimizes their effective incidence upon the larger struggles carried on by Marx, or he attributes them to some unknowables in the makeup of Marx's character.

Thus, for instance, the vile campaign carried on against Bakunin is laid at the door of a Russian by the name Outin, although anyone conversant with the history of the First International knows that this insignificant individual was but a blind tool in the hands of Marx. And much as Mehring tries to account for Marx's hatred toward Lassalle by the holy zeal of a revolutionist, he had to admit that in some cases it flowed from some irrational, and perhaps much less commendable, sources.

One could adduce numerous instances of this cavalier treatment of Marx's unsavory tactics, recognized as such by Mehring, but reduced by him to the dimensions of a minor fault in an otherwise impeccable character. But the latter is of secondary importance as compared to the systematic unfoldment of Marx's theoretical views in his works and political struggles. That the process of formulation of Marx's theoretical system is presented in this book with the reverential awe of a disciple tracing the emergence of a supreme truth, is more than to be expected on the part of a zealous Marxist like Mehring. And had this book been written before the colossal bankruptcy of the international social-democracy, we would have found the same awe displayed toward views on tactics and policies. But the tragic shadows of this bankruptcy were too deeply felt at the time Mehring wrote his book (1919), and perhaps by no one more so than by Mehring himself, who went the furthest in castigating the twofold betrayal of the revolutionary cause by the German party. While not

yet ready to see the line of continuity between this betrayal and the Marxist policies in the First International, he could not on the other hand champion them wholeheartedly. Marx's views and policies of that most crucial epoch are set forth faithfully, with due observance of chronological sequence, but the inner conviction of their correctness is lacking in this book.

And how, indeed, could Mehring pay more than lip service to the correctness of Marx's views on defending Germany against France when he had to take up cudgels against the very same views held by the German official party during the great war? How could he defend Marx's philistine exhortations made on the eve of the Paris Commune directed to the French workers with the view of restraining them from any revolutionary uprisings, if those were exactly the kind of tactics against which the Spartacus organization (and Mehring was one of its organisers) flung itself with so much passion? Or could Mehring give approval to the petty mockery coming from Marx and his lieutenants at the address of Bakunin's unsuccessful attempts to stir up a popular revolutionary movement in France, when the Spartacus organization had to meet the same mockery after each of its heroic attempts to shift the balance of the German Revolution to the left?

It is the tragic experience of the war and the following revolution that forced Mehring to reconsider the official version of the struggle between Marx and Bakunin. While he was not ready by any means to go as far as to champion Bakunin's historic case, he showed more than ordinary sympathy to his titanic work, trying whenever possible to soften the nature of Marx's opposition and his rancorous tactics. The result of such a retouching is a somewhat wishy-washy character drawing of Marx, who, whatever one might say about him, was always standing on his own feet. His acts can be explained by some objectionable feature in his character, but not by a weak willed yielding to the suggestions of his entourage. And certainly his tactical policies pursued in the First International, were not accidental. Mehring was too much of an historian to attribute to Marx a revolutionary policy harmonising with his own Spartacist views. And at the same time he would not or could not, undertake the historical reconstruction of the official version of that epoch which would show the decisive superiority of Bakunin in matters of revolutionary insight and action. Hence the pseudo-liberal, sentimental, diffused view of the titanic struggle between Marx and Bakunin, which in the long run does justice to neither of them and reduces an otherwise splendid book to mere chronicle writing.

Needless to say, the addendum of the "learned" Marxist professor, E. Fuchs to Mehring's account, intending to correct the Bakunist "deviation" on the part of Mehring, is to be treated with the full contempt its vile insinuations deserve. To insinuate that Bakunin was in the service of the Russian government, and that on the basis of his so-called "confession", the "sensational" character of which has been fully exploded by a number of savants, is to betray the low depths of moral degradation engendered by party fanaticism.

SENEX.

Class War Prisoners

The General Defense Committee of the I. W. W. has scored a partial victory in its fight for the freedom of the seven miners arrested during a strike in the Harlan coal region of Kentucky and sentenced to life imprisonment for the murder of three company guards who had fired on their picket line. Governor Laffoon on the eve of his retirement was persuaded by means of an affidavit obtained from the widow of one of the guards to commute the sentences of three of the defendants to time served. Since the affidavit attested to the widow's belief in the innocence of all seven miners, it was wondered why he commuted the sentences of only three albeit it was hoped that he might have set a precedent which his successor Chandler, despite his unfavorable affiliations, would be forced to follow. However, Chandler has done nothing as yet to indicate that he will do so. The wives and families of the convicted men attempted to see him on Christmas Eve to plead for the freedom of their loved ones but the governor did not avail himself of the opportunity to exercise executive clemency at this apparently propitious time. He did however promise to appoint a judge for a rehearing of the case in the near future.

Ferrero and Sallitto, two Italian workers who were arrested after a raid on their restaurant in San Francisco where they had rented space to a libertarian periodical "MAN", have been menaced with deportation for over a year. The raid followed a fake robbery perpetrated by Federal agents for the purpose of searching the premises. For over a year the government had been attempting to suppress the circulation of "MAN" by threatening its subscribers with imprisonment and deportation. These indirect tactics were resorted to in the face of the constitutional rights which prevented a direct attack on the publication. Meanwhile, the defense of these two workers has been extended on a national scale. The Ferrero-Sallitto Defense Conference of New York City has initiated a great united front protest against the deportations. Unions, churches, labor defense organizations, radical groups and individuals prominent in American life have joined in a powerful drive for the release of the defendants. Frances Perkins of the Labor Department at Washington, D. C. has been deluged with letters of protest; publicity of the case has been extended enormously.

At this time Ferrero and Sallitto are both being held for deportation on Ellis Island, New York. Ferrero was to have been deported on December 27 and Sallitto on January 10. Both deportations were stayed by applications for writs of habeas corpus. They are in imminent danger and the fight for their freedom must be carried on with increased energy.

If you have not already sent your protest to Washington do so at once and inform the Ferrero-Sallitto Defense Conference by postcard. Contribute heavily to this defense as funds are badly needed. Send all contributions to A. Alleva, Sec'y, P. O. Box 181, New York.

Subscribe to VANGUARD Only One Dollar for a Year.

Party Splits

Like the sons of Abraham the Communist parties of the world beget numerous offspring. But unlike the biblical sons, no homage or respect is paid to the father. A bitter hate exists and a barrage of slander is constantly being thrown back and forth. Each party claims to represent true communism. Each follows in the footsteps of Marx and Lenin. One and the other uses the sharp scalpel of dialectic materialism to forge its principles. All of them are guided by life itself, as revealed by Marxist critical thought in the daily struggles of the working class.

Splits are not new in the history of the communist movement. Without going into the past of the prewar Socialist Party, a goodly number of branches can be counted since the organization of the Comintern. Expulsions are frequent occurrences among the communists, and by their number one might say that more renegades find their way into the vanguards of Marxism than exist in the counter-revolutionary camp of the professed believers of capitalism. If a sufficiently important Son of the Prophet falls from grace his expulsion constitutes a split. Thus, Trotsky, Brandler, Lovestone, Weisbord became independent generals.

What accounts for this strange history of the Marxists? Each year the line tracing the development of the communist parties resembles more and more the picture of the tree of human evolution with its numerous branches, twigs and leaves. Shall we accept the word of the Stalinists that Trotsky was bribed by the imperialists who hunger for Soviet territory? Or perhaps these revolutionary intransigents suddenly found themselves in disagreement with some of the basic ideas of communism? Or is this spore-like division inherent in the structural and ideological principles of Marxism?

Only a fool can believe that Trotsky is in the pay of the "White Guards", and as Kerensky does until this very day, they might likewise believe that Lenin came to Russia in 1917 at the behest of the German government. Do differences in basic principles separate the splits? Then how can all be following the Marxist-Leninist line? In 1928 the American "Trotskyite" leaders were expelled from the Communist Party by an overwhelming majority vote though it was readily admitted that not one percent of the American membership knew what Trotskyism was. It might be also stated that the expelled "leadership" was a little vague on the counter-revolutionary stand they had taken. But expulsions there had to be for the Comintern was adopting a new line. Rout out the social-fascists who were responsible for the failure of the old policy. Surely Stalin was not to blame for the past mistakes. Brandler in Germany ruined the revolutionary opportunity of 1920. Lovestone had been leading the fatal policy of reforming the A. F. of L. Zack was still for isolating the party from the masses by refusing to go back to the A. F. of L. No end of victims can be found by an infallible bureaucracy that was making so many mistakes with the use of "tested revolutionary Marxism."

Thus the party with its highly centralized bureaucracy, with its members blindly following the leadership, finds convenient scape-goats for its every mistake. Each new split after expulsion discovers that the Stalinist line has betrayed Lenin, Marx the working class and the revolution.

Since the world wide split after the war, the Socialist Party had seemingly lost all the troublemakers to the Communists. Having abandoned a revolutionary policy no more serious fights occurred among the Socialists than those which periodically split the bourgeois political parties. However, at this time a more serious wedge is being driven into the ranks of the Socialists. Thousands of the followers of the movement are demanding a more revolutionary policy than that which led to world-wide defeat. The "old guard", steeped in its opportunistic policies, is resisting the more militant wing. This struggle has been brewing for the last three years on an international scale. In Europe the party is yielding to a degree. In America it appears the party is stalling until the formation of a Labor Party which the old guard seems to be anxiously awaiting and in which well-paid privileged positions are perhaps in store for them.

ROMAN WEINREBE.

THE FREE SOCIETY GROUP OF CHICAGO
is making a special offer for bundles of 100
and over of the following pamphlets at
a most unusually low price:

ANARCHISM AND AMERICAN TRADITIONS by V. DE CLEYRE and
WHAT IS ANARCHISM by HIPPOLYTE HAVEL — \$2.00 per 100.

BOLSHEVISM: PROMISES AND REALITIES by G. MAXIMOV—
\$4.00 per 100.

These prices exclude postage. Kindly send all orders and money to:

B. YELENSKY, 3332 Potomac Ave., Chicago, Ill.

Take advantage of these prices at once!

Some Recent Libertarian Publications:

The International Workingmens Ass'n: Its Principles, Aims and Tactics	05c.
The Revolutionary Movement in Spain by Dashar	10c]
The Principles of Anarchism by Dr. Maryson	10c.

Send orders to VANGUARD, 45 W. 17th St., New York City

Emma Goldman's "The Two Communisms"

The VANGUARD will publish soon, in pamphlet form, Emma Goldman's essay, "The Two Communisms: Bolshevist and Anarchists." This essay was originally written for *The American Mercury* which distorted it by deleting some of the most important sections. *The American Mercury* later released the copyright and Hearst reprinted an emasculated version of the article, deleting all those sections dealing with anarchism.

We feel sure that the pamphlet will much more than pay for itself very soon after publication. We are therefore asking those comrades and friends who can spare a few dollars to extend us small loans for a short time in order that we may print the pamphlet as soon as possible.

Order your bundles of "The Two Bolshevisms" now. Communicate with VANGUARD, 45 WEST 17th STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

How To Build Up VANGUARD

We must once again ask our readers to excuse the lateness of the publication of VANGUARD. Judging from the numerous letters of praise we have received, there is a growing demand for and interest in our magazine. But a magazine cannot live by compliments and good wishes. It requires regular contributions and a regular flow of new subscriptions. It was because of insufficient funds that we were late with this issue.

In order to insure the regularity and expansion of VANGUARD we should like to make the following suggestions to our comrades and readers: All sympathetic groups should send whatever they can afford in regular monthly contributions. Individual sympathisers should also send such regular monthly contributions. In return for all contributions we shall send bundles of VANGUARD to be sold or distributed free. Ask your local news dealer to put VANGUARD on his stand. Write us for our subscription blanks and donation lists. In centers where meetings are held you will find it easy to sell copies of VANGUARD. Those who have not yet subscribed should get subscriptions now! A subscription is only one dollar a year.

Send all Funds to VANGUARD, 45 West 17th Street, New York City.

This Offer Good Only Until March 15, 1936

FREE!

"THE LIFE OF ERRICO MALATESTA" by MAX NETTLAU
to each new VANGUARD subscriber.

•
Subscribe Now! — Only a Dollar (\$1.00) a year
•

Send money to VANGUARD, 45 W. 17th St., New York City.

